

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 1, 7, and 8 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 7 were objected to as containing informalities; Claim 6 was objected to under 37 U.S.C. § 1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependent form; Claim 9 was objected to under 37 U.S.C. § 1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependent form; and Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,484, hereinafter Iwai).

A Preliminary Amendment was filed in this application on April 28, 2006. Claims 6 and 9 were amended to depend solely from Claim 1 and Claim 10 was added. The outstanding Office Action failed to take this Preliminary Amendment into consideration. Via telephone exchange with the Examiner on March 7, 2008, the Examiner stated that a response should be filed pointing out the omission of Claim 10 from the examination of the application. It is respectfully requested that no final rejection of any of Claims 6, 9, or 10 be made in the next Office Action as no further amendments have been made to Claims 6, 9, or 10 by this amendment.

In response to the objection to Claims 1 and 7 as containing a typographical error in the form of the word “followings,” correction has been made to Claims 1 and 8. Since the word “followings” does not appear in Claim 7, it is assumed that the reference to Claim 7 in this objection was a typographical error and that it should have said Claim 8. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claims 1 and 7 be withdrawn.

In response to the objection to Claim 6 as being in improper multiple dependent form, the dependence of Claim 6 has been amended in the Preliminary Amendment to depend from

Claim 1 alone. The objection to Claim 6 is not understood because it does not appear that the claim was in improper multiple dependent form. However, the dependency of the claim has been changed in an effort to advance the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claim 6 be withdrawn.

In response to the objection to Claim 9 as being in improper multiple dependent form, the dependency of Claim 9 has been amended in the Preliminary Amendment to depend from Claim 1 alone. It is respectfully submitted that while original Claim 9 may have been in improper multiple dependent form, because it depended from original Claim 6 which was also multiply dependent, that Claim 9 as amended is now in proper multiple dependent form. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claim 9 be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwai be reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation in the combination that either the dR or the dG is larger than a gap distance which minimizes the brightness ratio at the viewing angle of 60° to the right. This feature is neither disclosed by nor obviated by Iwai.

Iwai relates to a reflective color liquid crystal display. In order that retardation of a liquid color layer may be dependent on wave length, for example, when a thickness of a liquid crystal layer is optimized to green light, coloring imbalance arises in the other colors. Iwai describes that in order to solve such a coloring balance discrepancy, in consideration of wave lengths dispersion, different thicknesses of a liquid crystal layer are chosen for each color. Nevertheless, Iwai gives no description of a selection of a gap distance for the red and green color components, which minimizes the brightness ratio at the viewing angle of 60° to the right as recited in Claim 1.

Claim 7 has been amended for the purpose of correcting a typographical error to change “to that in” to “from.” Claim 7 now recites, “a means for satisfying $LRB/(LRR+LRG+LRB) < 0.45$, where ratios of brightness of each color light in directions of 60° right and left from the front direction of the display screen are represented by LRR for red light, LRG for green light and LRB for blue light respectively.” This feature of Claim 7 is neither disclosed by nor obviated by Iwai.

Iwai fails to disclose a gap between electrodes such that the gap will be optimized in consideration of the influence of wave length dispersion in each color as recited in Claim 7. Furthermore, according to a technical solution proposed by Iwai, in a slanting view angle, deviation still exists between brightness ratios. For this reason, the brightness ratio at the viewing angle is 60° to the right and left cannot be kept within the limits as recited in Claim 7.

It is respectfully submitted that the dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10 are likewise patentable at least for the reasons argued above with respect to the claims from which they depend.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-9 over prior art is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Michael L. Gellner
Registration No. 27,256

MLG/wp/yst
I:\ATTY\MLG\AMENDMENT\289686US-AM.DOC